

ZAFARÁBAD. Since I wrote my former remarks I have found a direct mention of the occasion when Bídár was re-named Zafarábád. It is also frequently called Muḥammábád Bídár. The passage I refer to is in *Kháfi Khán*, II. p. 3. He tells us that in 1066 H., the thirtieth year of Sháhjahán, Prince Aurangzib was appointed to make a campaign against Bijápur, just after he had "by notable exertions, acquired the fort of Bídár and the Śúbah of Aḥmadábád, and the fort of Kaliyáuí, and "had re-named them the Śúbah of Zafarábád."

~~~~~

*Note on the preceding Paper.*—BY DR. A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

I fully agree with Mr. Irvine that Aurangzib's reign should be dated from 1068–1118 A. H. or 1658–1707 A. D. I had never made any special enquiries on the exact official date of his accession, and the initial date 1869, given in my coin-reports in the *Proceedings* was simply quoted as that usually assigned. That it is wrong,—if the reign is to be counted from the *officially* fixed date, and not from the date of the *actual* accession,—Mr. Irvine has amply established; and I agree with him, that it is more reasonable to accept the official date as fixed by an emperor himself.

I should, however, put "the two all-important things for us" rather in this form:—1. To know what date was officially fixed by an emperor; 2, to ascertain whether the date, officially fixed, was actually adhered to in dating coins and documents of his reign.

Now with regard to Aurangzib, nearly all his coins do adhere to the officially fixed date. There are, however, a few exceptions:—

1. There is the coin, No. 845 of the British Museum, dated in 1119 Hīrah, and 51 regnal. It is the only one with this peculiar date that I remember to have come across. As Aurangzib died on the 2nd March 1707, and the Hīrah year 1119 only commenced on the 3rd or 4th April 1707 (or the 1st Muḥarram 1119), it is clear that either the date 1119 is wrong, or that the coin is posthumous. That the latter may be the true explanation, appears from the following facts:—Aurangzib's successor was Bahádúr Sháh. He heard of his father's death only three weeks afterwards, on the 22nd March 1707, and his *actual* enthronement took place only on the 26th April 1707, that is, on the 24th Muḥarram 1119. It was not till the 25th December 1707, that the official date of his accession was fixed to be the 22nd March 1707. It is, therefore, quite possible that coins struck in the time intermediate between the 2nd March 1707, the date of Aurangzib's death, and the 26th April 1707, the date of Bahádúr Sháh's *actual* accession, were still issued in Aurangzib's name. It would thus occur that a coin,

struck between the 1st and 24th Muḥarram of 1119 Hījah, would be issued as one of Aurangzīb's, dated in his 51st year and in 1119 Hījah. This practice would cease as soon as the actual enthronement had taken place, and notice of the fact had been proclaimed in all mint-towns.

It would be interesting to know what the actual practice was with regard to coining during a period of temporary vacancy, whether actual or official, of the throne. When an emperor died, did the coining in his name cease in a mint-town, as soon as the news of his death reached that town; or was coining in his name continued, till news arrived of the *actual* accession of his successor; or was it continued till information was received of the *officially* fixed date of accession? Thus to take Aurangzīb's case as an example, did coining in his name cease from the 2nd March 1707 (the date of his death) in Aḥmadnagar (the place of his death), and similarly in other mint-towns as soon as the news of his death was received? Or did it cease from the 26th April 1707, the date of Bahádur Sháh's actual enthronement, in Láhor, and in other places as soon as information of the enthronement was received?

2. There is no real difficulty in the case of coins like the preceding. It is different with such coins of Aurangzīb as are dated in his first regnal year, and in 1070 Hījah. No. 728 in the British Museum is such a coin of the Patna mint. It is figured on Plate XIX of the B. M. Catalogue. The regnal year is expressed verbally *aḥad*. In my own collection, I have two such coins, of the mints Multán and Zafarábád respectively. The latter is from a treasure trove found in Champaran in 1892.

Now, reckoning by the *official* date, Aurangzīb's first year runs from the 1st Ramaẓán 1068 to the last Sha'bán 1069, and the second year, from the 1st Ramaẓán 1069 to the last Sha'bán 1070. Accordingly the coins of his first year might be dated in 1068 or 1069, those of his second year, in 1069 or 1070. But no coin could be dated both in his first year and in 1070. That dating is only admissible, if the accession of Aurangzīb is placed at some point of time in 1069.

These coins require some explanation. They certainly do not agree with the official reckoning. They are undoubtedly exceptional specimens, but they are not exceptionally rare, nor are they a vagary of some obscure or outlying mint-town. They were issued from places so well-known and so far apart, as Paṭná and Multán. It does seem that in the case of these coins, at least, the accession of Aurangzīb was dated from the 24th Ramaẓán 1069 (15th June 1659), the day on which the second enthronement took place with full ceremonials. But if so, how is the non-observance of the *officially* fixed date to be explained?

Is it possible, that there was an interval between the receipt of the news of the second enthronement and the receipt of the information of the officially fixed date, and that those exceptional coins were struck during that interval? The interval could not have been of long duration, and this explains the paucity of those peculiar coins. One can easily imagine that the news of the ceremonies of the second enthronement travelled faster, than the communication of the matters officially settled at that time. Still the interval must have been, at least, three months; for the *Hijrah* year 1070 commenced on the 18th September 1659; and no coin, with the dates 1070 and *aḥad*, could have been struck before the first month, or *Muḥarram*, of 1070 *Hijrah* (18th September to 17th October 1659). On the theory, here suggested, it is quite possible that also some of the extant coins, dated 1069 *Hijrah* and *aḥad* (or 1st year) regnal, were struck by the same wrong reckoning, that is, after the termination of the *officially* fixed first year. This would be the case with all those coins which were struck after the second enthronement and during the three last months of the *Hijrah* year 1069. When once the accession was *officially* antedated on the 1st *Ramaẓán* 1068, the three months after the *Ramaẓán* of 1069 (and in fact, that *Ramaẓán* itself) fell outside the first year of the reign. As the months of coining are not mentioned on Aurangzib's coins (as they are on some classes of coins of his predecessors), it is now impossible to determine, whether any of the coins, with 1069 *aḥad*, are really wrongly dated, if regard is had to the *official* reckoning.

For easy reference I here re-print, from the B. M. Catalogue (p. 392), the portion of the comparative table of the years A. H. and A. D. which is in question. The month, day, and day of the week of the Christian year are placed under each Muhammadan month, and correspond to the first of that month. The week-days are lettered from A (for Sunday) to G (Saturday). The months are indicated by Roman numerals. Thus the first entry 9 X C shows that the month of *Muḥarram* 1068 began on Tuesday the 9th October 1657.

| A. H. | A. D. | <i>Muḥarram</i> . | <i>Safar</i> .   | <i>Rab' I</i> .  | <i>Rab' II</i> . | <i>Jumádi I</i> .    | <i>Jumádi II</i> .   |
|-------|-------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1068  | 1657  | 9 X C             | 8 XI E           | 7 XII F          | 58, 6 I A        | 4 II B               | 6 III D              |
| 1069  | 1658  | 29 IX A           | 29 X C           | 27 XI D          | 27 XII F         | 59, 25 I G           | 24 II B              |
| 1070  | 1659  | 18 IX E           | 18 X G           | 16 XI A          | 16 XII C         | 60, 14 I D           | 13 II F              |
| A. H. | A. D. | <i>Rajab</i> .    | <i>Sha'bán</i> . | <i>Ramaẓán</i> . | <i>Shawwál</i> . | <i>Zú-l-Qa'dah</i> . | <i>Zú-l-Hijrah</i> . |
| 1068  | 1657  | 4 IV E            | 4 V G            | 2 VI A           | 2 VII C          | 31 VII D             | 30 VIII F            |
| 1069  | 1658  | 25 III C          | 24 IV E          | 23 V F           | 22 VI A          | 21 VII B             | 20 VIII D            |
| 1070  | 1659  | 13 III G          | 12 IV B          | 11 V C           | 10 VI A          | 9 VII F              | 8 VIII A             |